

2004 Transportation Summit - Research and Evaluation Summary

Linkages and/or connections with other teams:

- 1. Funding / Finance**
 - a.** <0.1% not enough! Vs. 3-10% private sector
 - b.** Not enough to go around. Competition for the same funds.
 - c.** Must be adequately funded
 - d.** Positive research will give credibility to request for increase funding. MTRB will require funding source.
- 2. Land use**
 - a.** A must to best handle Regional issues.
 - b.** Research on defining incentive for regional cooperation and development of effective tool for integrated land use.
- 3. Asset Mgt.**
 - a.** How data is best used?
 - b.** In order to develop appropriate models and implementation strategies research is needed
 - c.** Research to better utilize assessment and determination of strategies.
- 4. Coordination, Cooperation and Connectivity.**
 - a.** Advisory Board - ownership is the entire professional community vs. MDOT alone. Key to legislative tie.
- 5. Cooperation among stakeholders – need to create incentives; need to leave affiliation at the door.**
- 6. Safety**
 - a.** Aging population is going to drive the need for new research in signs, markings, signals, etc.
 - b.** continued research needed
 - c.** Research and analysis of traffic safety info.
- 7. Mobility**
 - a.** Research on needs and styles of the Michigan population as well as seamless and cost effective inter modal transportation.
 - b.** Interact with mobility to evaluate feasibility of suggested projects.
- 8. Linkages with all action groups for funding and research.**
- 9. Need to determine priorities of research results.**
- 10. Definition/vision of what is meant by transportation research.**
- 11. Research on new sources of revenue.**
- 12. Innovative sources of revenue, partnering, to garner moneys.**
- 13. Communication in linking stakeholders early on in the process with any development structural project particulars to property owners, businesses, etc.**
- 14. Traditional Stakeholders such as communities, chambers of commerce, citizens, and business**
- 15. Other teams will determine research needs**
- 16. MTRB can provide information to the communication and funding teams for their agendas.**
- 17. Commerce & Trade – include private sector in opportunities for funding research**
- 18. Commerce and trade**
 - a.** Research in increasing capacity and efficiency of transportation infrastructure.
 - b.** Interact with commerce and trade to evaluate feasibility of suggested projects

2004 Transportation Summit - Research and Evaluation Summary

Suggestions for resources to complete the implementation tasks (people, groups, money):

1. Improve relationships/ partnerships with legislators.
2. Successfully acquire more research money from industry groups (insurance, builders, other industry groups, ect).
3. Toll Roads – certain roads in Michigan would be saleable (US – 12 Detroit to Chicago)
4. MTRB needs to be formalized, legitimized and given authority to carry out functions. Consolidate many of the similar groups into MTRB. All major research initiatives need to be coordinated through MTRB.
5. Involvement of all potential stakeholders.
6. Legislation for redistribution of SBR funds.
7. Involve private funding – road builders, asphalt producers, concrete/paving association, engineers and consultants.
8. Setting up a data bank of FAQ's, resources to obtain previous results.
9. Governors Transportation Safety Advisory Committee
10. Mega University Consortium
11. Evaluating projects- research Criteria, evaluation if need money, system of triages.
12. TRB
13. NCHRP
14. FDOT
15. funds from federal transportation act
16. foundations
17. Involvement with NTRB to obtain knowledge of funding.
18. MCHRB – database funds
19. FHWA
20. Paving Consortium of Pooled Moneys - Federal monies granted towards
21. Put together 3 or 5 year call for research
22. VII vehicle infrastructure integration US DOT initiative for ITS. Board should steer funding in proposed direction. Make up of board should minimize “Pet Rocks”
23. Board needs to have “teeth” – funding control.
24. Team up with other states with similar problems. (Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa (Frozen Foot) & Canada. Go after national pooled funding.
25. Political teaming with other states makes sense, reduces ones laps of research.
26. Percent amount for “high risk” initiative moving research along rather than implementing.
27. National Industry Research Activities for pool funds research projects
28. National Asphalt Assn. – NCAT Auburn University
29. American Concrete Paving Assn.
30. National Aggregate Assn. – International Center for Aggregates, University of Texas
31. AASHTO Research
32. Center for Cement Concrete Paving – Iowa State University
33. Michigan Center for Pavement restoration